



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,716	03/14/2000	Bryan W. Wolf	6671.US.01	8310

25755 7590 12/31/2002

ROSS PRODUCTS DIVISION OF ABBOTT LABORATORIES
DEPARTMENT 108140-DS/1
625 CLEVELAND AVENUE
COLUMBUS, OH 43215-1724

EXAMINER

CHOI, FRANK I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/524,716

Applicant(s)

WOLF ET AL.

Examiner

Frank I Choi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19, 22, 25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 22 and 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18, 19, 22, 25 are allowed subject to update of the prior art search herein.

Claim Objections

Claims 12, 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 11 as written indicates that the carbohydrate can only be fructose, at least one digestible glucose polymer, and optionally, nonabsorbent carbohydrates in the claimed amounts. As such, further, optionally, adding dietary fiber or indigestible oligosaccharides actually broadens the claim. See MPEP Section 2111.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claims 11-17, 27 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in Paper No. 16, filed 10/15/2002. In that paper, applicant has stated "the amended claims require a carbohydrate mixture that consists of two rapidly absorbed carbohydrates, fructose and glucose polymer, and nonabsorbent carbohydrates", and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because the claims contain less than

Art Unit: 1616

20% w/w of nonabsorbent carbohydrates which limitation includes 0% w/w. As such, the amended claims do not necessarily require that a nonabsorbent carbohydrate be present.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,292,538) in view of in view of Kaufman (U.S. Pat. 5,843,921) for the reasons of record and the further reasons below.

Paul et al. and Kaufman were discussed in the prior Office Action and the same are incorporated herein.

Examiner has duly considered Applicant's arguments but deems them unpersuasive.

Applicant argues that rapid emptying of the stomach and rapid absorption of nutrients is counter to the goal of the claimed diabetic formulas of the instant invention where prolonged release of the nutrients into the GI track delayed metabolism of carbohydrates is the key to help to delay or blunt the glycemic response. However, Paul also teaches the prior art composition by combining the fructose and glucose polymers provides a source of energy over a sustained period of time (Paul et al., column 4, lines 30-48). As such, in light of the fact that fructose does not require insulin to be metabolized, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that the prior art composition would blunt the post-prandial response.

Art Unit: 1616

Applicant also argues that one knowledgeable in the art would not take the rapidly absorbed carbohydrate system of Paul and incorporate it into the diabetic formulation of Kaufman and expect to see stabilized glucose levels because Paul mixture does not include the slowly metabolized carbohydrate. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In any case, as indicated above, Paul does teach that the fructose/glucose polymer combination provides for a sustained release of energy.

Applicant argues that the references do not speak to the use of nonabsorbent carbohydrates. However, Kauman teaches the use of carbohydrates which are slowly digested and not completely metabolized even after 3-4 hours (Kaufman, Column 3, lines 1-4) which would appear to fall within the scope of the term "nonabsorbent carbohydrates" as Applicant's Specification indicates that the same is resistant to endogenous digestion.

Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because every element of the invention has been collectively taught by the combined teachings of the references.

Art Unit: 1616

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

A facsimile center has been established in Technology Center 1600. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machines are (703) 308-4556 or (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Choi whose telephone number is (703) 308-0067. Examiner maintains a flexible schedule. However, Examiner may generally be reached Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 5:30 pm (EST), except the first Friday of the each biweek which is Examiner's normally scheduled day off.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. José Dees, can be reached on (703) 308-4628. Additionally, Technology Center 1600's Receptionist and Customer Service can be reached at (703) 308-1235 and (703) 308-0198, respectively.

FIC

December 28, 2002



JOHN PAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600

